

Application No. 09/543,663
Amendment Dated April 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed January 24, 2007, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 have been rejected. In response, the applicants have submitted the following remarks. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, and 22-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,393 to Ribitzky (hereafter Ribitzky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,675 to Evans et al.(hereafter Evans), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,629 to Cooke, Jr. et al (hereinafter Cooke). The applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

In the previous Office Action dated July 19, 2006, it was stated that Ribitzky teaches a functionality code segment and a first user interface code segment having a functionality code segment and a second user interface code segment and a container application having a first user interface layer in communication with a PACS and a second user interface later in communication with a RIS, wherein the first and second user interface layers are configured convert the first user interface code segment of the PACS and the second user interface code segment of the RIS to a uniform user interface and to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the PACS and the RIS. The following citations were made to support this assertion: Ribitzky, column 9, lines 45-67 to column 10, line 59. The undersigned argued (and renews the same) that the functionality code segment and first user interface code segment for the PACS and the functionality code segment and the second user interface code segment for the RIS, as well as the first and second user interface layers in a

container application are not taught anywhere in those citations of Ribitzky, and further, nowhere in Ribitzky at all.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the present Office Action, the Examiner indicates in paragraph B, that Evans teaches this functionality in column 5, lines 11-51 and column 14, lines 1-67. As stated previously, Evans does not teach a PACS having a functionality code segment and a first user interface code segment, nor a RIS having a functionality code segment and a second user interface code segment, and further nor a first user interface layer and a second user interface layer contained in a container application for communicating the PACS and RIS, respectively.

Therefore, neither Ribitzky nor Evans teach such elements.

The Applicants respectfully submit that while a “container” application 212 is specifically taught in Ribitzky, the Applicants are unable to identify a teaching of a functional code segment and a first user interface, or a functional code segment. Furthermore, and following, because no such teaching exists, Ribitzky can not teach first and second interface layers in communication with the user interfaces. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to identify these teachings in Ribitzsky or Evans.

As is recognized by the Office Action, Ribitzsky does not teach the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments and the first and second computer components are formatted with the same look and feel.

Furthermore, it is recognized in the Office Action that Ribitzsky and Evans combined do not teach a PACS or a RIS.

Within the Office Action, it is stated that Evans teaches a uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the first and second components are formatted with the same look and feel. Evans teaches a system and method for using a relational database to enable the dynamic configuration of an application program. As is taught in several passages of Evans, this invention teaches utilizing a relational database to uniformly configure data from a single application

program, not from multiple components. Referring to the cited column 7 and 8 of Evans, and the corresponding figures, the Applicants respectfully submit that it is apparent that the Evans references does indeed utilize a relational database to uniformly configure data from a single application program, as none of the figures, nor the accompanying specification even show or disclose multiple applications (such as PACS or RIS) from which to pull first and second functionality code segments and user interface code segments for formatting to the same look and feel.

The Applicants respectfully agree that Cooke teaches a PACS configured with a RIS interface (cited by Examiner).

However, the Applicants respectfully submit that there are a number of applications and issued patents that include PACS and RIS applications, but none of them, including the cited Cooke reference teach the configuration of the present invention as described and claimed. Furthermore, even if Cooke were combined with the Ribitzky and/or Evans references, the claimed invention would not be taught, as described above, none of these references include the functionality code segments, user interface code segments, and user interface layers as described and claimed above.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a data management system for patient data, comprising a PACS having a functionality code segment and a first user interface code segment, a RIS having a functionality code segment and a second user interface code segment, and a container application having a first user interface layer in communication with the PACS and a second user interface layer in communication with the RIS, wherein the first and second user interface layers are configured to convert the first user interface code segment of the PACS and the second user interface code segment of the RIS to a uniform user interface and to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS, respectively, and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel.

As described above, neither Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, nor their combination teach or make obvious a functionality code segment and a user interface code segment, nor a uniform user interface to communicate patient data between the functionality code segments of the components and the uniform user interface such that the patient data of the functionality code segments of the PACS and RIS are formatted with the same look and feel.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 28-31 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 20-31 are also allowable being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 7 is directed to a data management system for patient data. For the same reasons described above for Claim 1, the independent Claim 7 is also allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination.

Claims 8 and 10-11 depend upon the independent Claim 7. As described above, the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 10-11 are also allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 22 is directed to a method of displaying patient data from a plurality of applications. For the reasons described above in Claims 1 and 7, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination.

Claims 23-27 depend upon the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Ribitzky, Evans, Cooke, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 23-27 are also allowable being dependent upon allowable base claim.

For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at

Application No. 09/543,663
Amendment Dated April 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007

(414)271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By Christopher M. Scherer
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Attorney Docket No.: 15-IS-5288 (5024-00039)